

From the Boston Atlas.

THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH.

We find in the New Orleans Commercial Times, of the 26th ult., a well-written, and, considering the region from which it emanates, a temperate article, under the caption of "Slavery in the United States." The writer, notwithstanding his desire to discuss the question fairly, falls into the common error which Southern writers generally do respecting public opinion in the North, and the objects which the people of the North aim at. Whether this continued misrepresentation is the result of error, or of design, we will not now attempt to decide. We are continually held up as fanatics, whose objects are to dissolve the Union, or to encroach upon the rights of the Southern States, as guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. Now, the people of the North are neither fanatics nor disunionists. There are, indeed, a few persons who advocate "no union with the South"; but they comprise but a very small portion of the people of the Free States. They are men who oppose all human governments, and who take no part in elections, and who never vote. These men may be classed as "fanatics"; but they are far less fanatical in their notions than many who claim the highest rank among the chivalry of the South. The late letter of Mr. Calhoun, to certain gentlemen in Georgia, contains more of fanaticism and of practical disunion than can be found in any document which has yet emanated from the anti-slavery "fanatics" of New England or of Ohio.

The writer in the New Orleans Times exhibits a lively apprehension of the immense evils to the South which are sure to follow, as he thinks, the passage of the Wilmot Proviso. He says:—"The Wilmot Proviso will be followed by the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, a total repeal of the laws requiring the delivery of fugitive slaves, and the prohibition of the transfer and sale of slaves between the States." We will not deny that all these measures may follow the passage of the Wilmot Proviso; yet it is not a logical deduction from the premises. They are totally different and independent questions, and may in time pass Congress, whether the Wilmot Proviso passes or not. The advance of free principles, we trust, will one day sweep from the world every vestige of slavery and oppression; and so the result will be the work of the whole people—the South as well as the North. Of this we are certain—there is no political party in the North that desires to disturb the Union of the States, or to violate one jot or tittle of the Federal Constitution; whatever the Constitution guarantees to the South, that shall be held sacred; but we can find nowhere in the Constitution any article which would preclude the passage of the Wilmot Proviso. It is not "no union with the South" which it involves; it is older than the Constitution. It is nearly the precise words of the Ordinance of 1787, which precluded slavery from the Northwest territories—an Ordinance which was reported by a Committee composed of Mr. Carrington of Virginia, Mr. Dane of Massachusetts, R. L. Lee of Virginia, Mr. Keen of South Carolina, and Mr. Sumner of New York—three Southern men and two from the North. It passed the Congress unanimously on the 13th of July, 1787. The territory, from which slavery was thus excluded forever, is now comprised in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, and which now contain a population of 4,175,000 freemen. Although at the time the Ordinance passed, the total population did not exceed 3000, comprised in seven small French settlements, five of which were on the Mississippi, one at Vincennes, on the Wabash, and one at Detroit, now the capital of Michigan.

The Missouri compromise involves the same principle, and if the Wilmot Proviso is unconstitutional so is it. The New Orleans paper imagines that the anti-slavery sentiment is more rampant at the North, among the Free States, than it has ever been before. The history of the past does not bear out the assertion; the discussion on the Missouri question was more determined and more hostile to the extension of slavery, on the part of Northern men, a hundred fold, than was shown upon the proposition to admit the slaveholding republic of Texas into this Union. The change in sentiment, spoken of by our New Orleans friend, since the early days of the republic, has taken place in the South. The North remains where it was. The South, not content to let slavery remain where the Constitution found it, has, of late years, exerted all its powers to the annexation of Texas. "That republic came into this Union without a square foot of its soil devoted to freedom. In that struggle, as in this, the North was beaten. A new question now arises: more new territory, it is now said, must be admitted. The South want it, the North does not. The South say it must come, it is our 'inevitable destiny.' Then it must come, in say we of the North, it must remain forever free soil. You shall not extend to the light of slavery, and we believe the position of the free North, with a few exceptions. There is no fanaticism in all this; the North are deliberate, determined and conscientious in the position they have assumed. The South may call hard names, and make threats of dissolving the Union. This may produce a little effervescence on both sides of the line, but it will not shake the fixed purpose of the Northern people. As members of the Union they will abide by the Constitution. They ask not to intermeddle with any institution of the South, but when they are asked to become parties to extend an institution like that of slavery over a land from which it is now excluded, they cannot and will not do it.

From the Boston Courier.

REV. DR. PUTNAM'S SERMON.

This was preached in Roxbury on a recent Fast day. There seems to be a tacit understanding, that on such occasions, reverend clergymen shall be obliged to say a few words in relation to the ordinary Sabbath. Whatever they list, they utter from the fullness of their hearts. Topics carefully shunned in their weekly sermons may be couched, while their congregations shall patiently listen to all that an honest heart may utter. In short, on Fast day and Thanksgiving day, the pulpit has its saturnalia, when it may speak without fear of reproof from the world. This morning a pleasant surprise, if it did not remind us too strongly of the general service, from which it seems to afford a temporary relaxation.

The congregation of Dr. Putnam were unwilling that his discourse on the recent Fast day should be confined to its influence to a single church. It has accordingly been published by their request, and perhaps may now be read and heard by the many of their approbation. It is curious, in several points of view. It serves to show the tendencies of public opinion. It furnishes another illustration of the conduct of the Christian pulpit. Still more, it gives occasion to know the sentiments of its reverend author on certain important matters, expressed on a day of freedom, when he spoke without constraint, and according to the biases of his conscience.

It has the merit of Dr. Putnam's discourses—distinctness, point, facility of expression, and a natural eloquence. Its main object is to rebuke those who, vexed by the atrocities of the Mexican war, and of slavery, wish to withdraw from all support of the Union and of the government. It vindicates the necessity of government, and the importance of the Union. These points may be regarded as the two hinges of the discourse. Although we should not join with the author in all his reasoning on these topics, nor in all the language he has been willing to employ, yet we concur with him generally in his conclusions. In our eyes, government is a necessity, and the Union a blessing, both of which, with all their faults, we cherish with an abiding attachment.

But concurring with Dr. Putnam in these conclusions, we have not been able to read his discourse without pain. We have regretted it much, on account of the Christian pulpit to which he belongs, and on his own account. It is a discourse which gives mournful evidence that a worthy clergyman may preach—unconsciously, perhaps—not so much according to the high standard of Abolition Right, as according to the received standard of his congregation—that his opinions and expressions may be pruned and trimmed exclusively to their taste—in short, that his sermon may be a reflection exclusively of their own minds. It is needless to add that such a sermon can do very little good to the people to whom it is addressed.

It is probable that not a single person in his whole congregation, who maintains the obnoxious opinion, on which he disclaimed.

Nay, more, it is most probable, that a large portion of his congregation joined with their reverend pastor in animosity against those opinions. They who professed them were absent; they are few in number, and are the objects of much severe animadversion. Dr. Putnam regards them as earnest and conscientious. Others, who know them, bear witness to their self-sacrifice, and to their untiring devotion to one of the greatest causes—perhaps the greatest—of practical benevolence, which has ever occupied the thoughts of men. Surely, if there are like these, although they may be called Garrisonians, were entitled to careful treatment from a Christian pastor, like Dr. Putnam, nor should he have been willing to employ the license of Fast day, in "feeding fat" the prejudices of his congregation.

Garrisonians cannot claim immunity from criticism; but justice demands that a Christian pastor should not make these few much-abused persons the scape-goats on whom his arguments and indignation are to descend. Were there no opinions nestling in the hearts of his own congregation that needed rebuke? He says, incidentally, "among other sorts of sin, there is a great deal of sympathy with slaveholding, and a readiness to help the South in perpetuating and extending it." Let us ask distinctly, Are there not many persons in Dr. Putnam's own society who have sympathy with slaveholding? If so, why leave this sin without the lash? Why not point his sermon directly at this ally of slavery?

It would have been more manly, more Christian, more worthy of his name, and of the day, if Dr. Putnam had earnestly grappled with the "sin of indifference to the sufferings of the slave, which prevails so much in Christian churches—if he had denounced all sympathy with slaveholding in tones that might arouse languid consciences—and had called upon his own congregation,—face to face, eye to eye—to join with him in earnest efforts, not to destroy the Union or government, but to abolish slavery. Then, he might, perhaps, with seeming propriety, have reproved the impracticable and unconstitutional course of others. But no! If he had once surrendered to this strain, he could not have found it in his heart to direct the prejudices of his audience against fellow Christians, who were laboring so strenuously to overthrow the system of slavery. His difference of opinion would have been absorbed in the earnestness of sympathy in the great work.

But Dr. Putnam's discourse shows no earnest opposition to slavery. Perhaps he feels none. We do not undertake to judge him. It is evident that he is much in earnest, while speaking of weak, humble, and impracticable Garrisonians; but when he approaches slavery, pregnant with evils as the womb of sin, he is measured and moderate in his language; nor does he bring home to his own congregation the absorbing moral and political duty of striving constantly and resolutely, by speech, vote and influence, in every constitutional way, for its abolition. Such words of might have done good. They would have been candid. They possibly might not have been acceptable to all his audience; but they could not fail to have touched some honest hearts, who would have blessed the true preacher who did not hesitate to declare unwelcome verities.

John Randolph, who should not be named without reprobation of his unchristianable baseness—was accustomed to say, that he would go a mile out of his way to kick a sheep. The Rev. Dr. Putnam has travelled far out of his way to "kick the Garrisonians." But this is not all; he has "kicked" in sympathy with a large congregation, and with the public beside; and, in doing so, has given occasion to the unpleasant observation, that the pulpit acts in selfish union with those who support it, and that preachers are not the fearless guides and leaders of opinion, but merely its representatives.

From the Boston Whig.

THE LATIMER LAW.

If there be any persons who can heretofore have doubted the propriety of such a law as the Latimer Law, they will scarcely resist the force of the evidence supplied by the following paragraph. To make free territory non-slaveholding grounds is not a new thing, but the purpose of the new Constitution. Let those who attempt it, do so at their peril!

PURSUANT OF A SLAVE IN NEW JERSEY.—Two men from Maryland arrived last week at Post Elizabeth, Cumberland Co., in search of a negro who they alleged had run away from his master. After ascertaining his whereabouts, they procured of Mr. Mayhew, constable, and accompanied him in the service. They found the man at work in a cornfield, who no sooner discovered his old acquaintances than he gave them the lie; whereupon one of the men fired the contents of a six-barrelled pistol at him, but more fortunately, he missed him than he would have done. The Bridgeton Chronicle very justly complains of the constable for permitting this attempt upon human life to pass without arresting the author, who, upon being taken, had confessed that he had killed the negro, he doubtless would have been hanged according to the laws of our State. As it was, it was the duty of the constable to have arrested him at once, to answer the attempt upon life.

Mrs. FOLK.—The Columbia (Tenn.) Morning Herald, Tuesday, July 30, says: "The lady, formerly of the President, left this place yesterday for the residence of her mother, in Rutherford county. We understand that she will return in a few days to Washington."—[Argus.]

Well, what of it? Several women—not ladies made up by milliners and mantua-makers, but real women, the noblest work of God—left their homes in the country, and have come to us, with their eyes full of blueberries picked by their own hands—nice ones they were too—and after selling them returned home the same evening. These women are doing some good in the world, but papers take no notice of them; but if Mrs. Folk, the lady of the man-selling, war-making President, who has a herd of colored landmen and millions of landless white slaves at work on her plantations, were to sell a few blueberries, and to support a pleasure excursion on money wrung from the sinews of these bondmen or received as the price of their bodies and their souls, the papers up and tell of it as though some wonderful act had been performed. O, Fudge!—Portland Pleasure-Bond.

AN ANTI-SLAVERY CHRISTIAN DENOMINATION.

Below we give our readers the Protest against Slavery, recently put forth by the Free Will ministry, and signed as we suppose by the great body of their ministers in the Union.

It is good. So far as we see, it is just what it should be—a protest against slavery—a public declaration of our position, and a challenge to the world. It is in our view what the nature of the case demands.

The ministry cannot by their own act abolish slavery; they cannot physically and politically coerce the slaveholding states to abolish it, but they can withhold the implied sanction which the American church has so long given to the system; they can substitute for this long-continued sanction, outspoken, unmitigated condemnation. Thus they may contribute their part to drive slavery from its sheltered retreat within the sanctuary of God, fast hold upon the horns of the altar. Let the nation know that the malediction of God and all good men is out against slavery and its abettors;—then let it live if it can.—Oberlin Evangelist.

The following is from a Savannah paper, being a letter from a patriotic father, which will explain itself:

"My four eldest sons, Daniel, William, George, and Charles, have all volunteered and have started for Mexico. Should it last ten years longer, there will not be four more efficient men in Gen. Taylor's army than my four gallant sons. They are all healthy, sober, intelligent, handsome, aspiring, powerful, patriotic, large young men, and they are determined to distinguish themselves individually or die. Daniel and Billy are commissioned officers, and have the best chance (if their lives are spared) of promotion. George, poor fellow, is only third corporal, and must fight himself out to notice. Charles, the youngest man of the four, is a private. My sons will also stick together, through thick and thin, and all sink or swim together. Charles is able to fight himself into notice, he is six feet three inches high, and will be the strongest man amongst a thousand. I glory in their spirit and patriotism. Our country, right or wrong, is their motto; and when wrong, they will stick to her closer. All we fear is vomit or other disease. If I could, I would be found in the midst of my brave boys, but I am now getting old and good for nothing."

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, AUGUST 27, 1847.

DEMOCRATIC ENGLAND AND OLIGARCHIC AMERICA.

The news from England, by the Cambria, is of a very important and interesting character. Important and interesting, not so much from what it tells, as from what it foretells. Not so much from change that it narrates, as from change that it forebodes. It is not the events that have actually entered upon the scene, but the shadows of events yet to come, practically projected from the near future, that mark the present as a cardinal moment in English history.

The history of Parliament has been for centuries the history of England. St. Stephen's Chapel has been the true theatre upon which it has been presented before the nation. The temper of the House of Commons has for three hundred years been the index of that of the people, which were sovereigns have regarded and foolish ones despised to their cost. A new House is a kind of a Nihilometer, which tells how high the popular flood has risen, and how it compares with the measurements of former years. Such a gauge has just been taken, and the result proves that the current runs deeper and stronger than it has ever yet done.

The great revolutions of English history have been parliamentary revolutions. Even the fields of Naseby and Marston Moor were in effect fought at Westminster. The first downfall of the Stuart dynasty, its brief restoration and final ruin, were all the work of the People of England, speaking through its Parliaments. And, especially, from the time that the Convention Parliament vindicated the right of the Nation to change the line of succession, when their liberties demanded it, and established the existing Constitution on a recognized foundation, has the British Senate been the scene of British history. Within this century, above all, and particularly within the last twenty years, phase after phase of the great Revolution, which began as long ago as when the Puritans undertook to reform the Reformation, and which, though it has at times seemed to retrograde, has never really gone backward, have presented themselves in quick succession before the astonished gaze of Christendom.

There are no more illustrious trophies chronicled in English annals, than those which have been won in the peaceful fields of Westminster, within the last twenty years. The barbarous triumphs of savage Edwards and Henrys, the glories of Cressy and Poitiers and Agincourt, pale their lustre by the side of the beneficent victories of enlightened legislation. Victories of advancing civilization over hoary abuses and time-honored barbaries. Religious bigotry, political corruption, negro slavery, extravagance of penal cruelty, selfish monopoly in food, have all been rebuked and abolished. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation, Reform in Parliament, the Abolition of Slavery, the Mitigation of the Penal Code, Reform in the administration of Law, and the abrogation of the Corn Laws, are but a part of the innovations of the last score of years. And the procession is not yet wound up. The last of the train, like Banquo's descendant,

That shows us many more.

It sounds paradoxical, but it is true, to say that the voice of the people of England is more potent for national reformations than that of America. There is, in effect, but one political power in the British Empire; and that is the House of Commons. King and Lords are merely drags upon the machine of State. They may retard its motion for a while, but they can never check it entirely. Both know that when a sufficient head of popular steam is on, they must get off the track, or be crushed to atoms. The King is in the hands of the Commons, and the Lords are in the hands of the King. The power of the Purse controls the power of the Sword. The personal dignity of the Fountain of Honor keeps the streams that flow from it in check. The King cannot move hand or foot without the permission of his faithful Commons. And the Lords know that the unlimited prerogative of Creation will make the dignity of the Peerage dirt-cheep, if their resistance to necessary change is pushed to its utmost theoretical extent. The King has a Constitutional Veto; but it has not been used for a hundred and fifty years. The House of Lords have a legislative power co-ordinate with the House of Commons; but the day is long past since they dared to interpose their negative between the deliberate will of the people and its legislative accomplishment.

In the national Policy of America, too, there is but one power; and that is the SLAVE POWER. The Constitution of England is, in effect, a democracy under the forms of a monarchy and hereditary aristocracy. Ours, on the other hand, is an hereditary aristocracy of the closest and the vilest nature, under the forms of an unlimited democracy. We have so contrived and managed our institutions that an hereditary oligarchy, founded on property in human beings, has a complete and absolute check on the whole machine; besides the incidental, but controlling, power which its union on all important subjects enables it to exert in their decision. The actual number of voting slaveholders (deducting women, minors and absentees) is not much more than one hundred thousand, certainly not more than one hundred and fifty thousand, and yet they possess, in consequence of their ownership of human souls, a clear majority of FOUR members in the Senate of the United States! This body is a branch of the National Legislature co-ordinate with the House of Representatives; it can originate and negative bills; it has a veto in every nomination to office from the highest to the lowest; and it is an essential element of the treaty-making power. The House of Lords never possessed, in its palmy days, power comparable to that of the Senate. Its number cannot be increased except by the admission of new States; and as to this, it has an absolute veto. The members are for six years, and for that time are independent of all mortal control. The slaveholding element is thus the governing principle of the nation; for it has the power of blocking the wheels of government, through its majority in the Senate, as effectively as the Commons have those of the English government. There has been no such oligarchy in modern times as that formed by the slaveholding majority of the United States' Senate. None, at least, since Venice.

'Sunk, like a sea-weed, into whence she rose!' This forms the great distinction between the English and the American Policy, and accounts for the different results that flow from them. The English Constitution has an elasticity which enables it to adapt itself to every new state of things. The King and the Lords must be conservatives or reformers according as the general will of the nation dictates. The Prime Minister is merely the Palmaris of the Ship of State—the pilot that weathers the storm.

—not the Deity that rouses the tempest and rules the waves. Thus when in 1841 the people of England, tired of the inefficiency and 'finality' of the Whigs, made Sir Robert Peel Premier, it was fondly thought that a Tory Ministry was established. But, lo! it was not long before he found that it was only by becoming more Whiggish than the Whigs, and almost as Radical as the Radicals, that the ship could be sailed. And so a Protectionist Parliament was compelled to lay infinitesimal bands on the policy of Protection!

The American Constitution, on the other hand, has no elasticity in its nature. The slaveholding element, which it has made supreme, never yields, but is ever encroaching. It is the Iron Shroud of Liberty, which not only never gives way before her struggles, but is forever clasping her round with a closer and closer embrace. It is politically omnipotent, and, of course, will set its pleasure. No political pressure from without can modify its action, as long as such pressure must be directed against that same Constitution which gives it its despotic power. The only hope of Freedom is, that its very unyieldingness may, in process of events, break the machine in pieces; so that a wiser scheme of government may be constructed out of the ruins, and with the experience, of the original failure.

It makes no difference as to the working of our Government, that the controlling members of it are appointed by ballot. The slaveholding majority will represent the will of the supreme slaveholding power, of whatsoever individuals it may be made up. So it is of no practical consequence that the Kingly office, and even the Upper House of the Legislature, should be hereditary, in England, as long as the Popular Will is, in the last resort, the governing principle. If the habits of the nation have become accustomed to this system, it would be folly to attempt a sudden change for the sake of theoretic symmetry. Folly, because it could not be done until the General Mind was ripe for the change; when it would follow as the form of the shadow follows the altered shape of the substance that projects it. Thus the Eastern and the Western shores of the Atlantic present the converse political paradoxes, of a Democratic Monarchy and an Oligarchic Democracy!

This difference in the elasticity of the two forms of government accounts for their different effect on the character of Public Men. A man may go to public life in England, ambitious of achieving personal distinction by the championship of great political reforms, and may retain his self-respect and dignity of character through the whole of a distinguished career. Because such is the nature of the Institutions with which he has to deal, that any amount of amendment is possible, and there is no power of force enough to control the Determination of the People. An American Statesman, on the contrary, the moment he exchanges the political arena of his State, (analogous to the Municipalities of England), for that of the Nation, sees that he has no possible prospect of political eminence, except by subservience to the Slave Power,—by sacrificing the interests of Liberty to those of Slavery. Hence that disgraceful system of political prostitution to which all aspirants for preferment must submit. A system to which there are no exceptions, unless it be here and there a political martyr, who endeavors to maintain his faith, though it be at the cost of his political existence.

It is because of the supreme control which the House of Commons exerts over the destinies of the Empire, and of its mighty influence over those of the world, that an election like that which was in progress, at the last advices, is of such an universal and permanent interest. It is prophetic of peaceful and beneficent Revolution. It shows that the popular element is growing stronger and stronger, and more and more conscious of its strength. The defeat of four members of the Whig Government, Sir John Canning, at Nottingham, by Feagus O'Connor, the leader of the Chartists, Thomas Babington Macaulay at Edinburgh, by Mr. Cowan, an Anti-Slavery Church tradesman, Benjamin Hawes, at Lambeth, by Mr. Pearson, the Non-Conformist candidate, and above all, General Fox, at the Tower Hamlets, by GEORGE THOMPSON, (of whose election, presently,) and the return of such men as Henry Vincent for Ipswich, and W. J. Fox for Oldham, speak significantly of change at hand. The principle of progress is at work. Better days are coming. Great things have been already done; but greater yet remain behind. Mighty events are knocking at the door. Many of these, this Parliament will usher into the domain of History. And of yet more and mightier, it will prepare the way and proclaim the advent.—q.

struggles, but is forever clasping her round with a closer and closer embrace. It is politically omnipotent, and, of course, will set its pleasure. No political pressure from without can modify its action, as long as such pressure must be directed against that same Constitution which gives it its despotic power. The only hope of Freedom is, that its very unyieldingness may, in process of events, break the machine in pieces; so that a wiser scheme of government may be constructed out of the ruins, and with the experience, of the original failure.

It makes no difference as to the working of our Government, that the controlling members of it are appointed by ballot. The slaveholding majority will represent the will of the supreme slaveholding power, of whatsoever individuals it may be made up. So it is of no practical consequence that the Kingly office, and even the Upper House of the Legislature, should be hereditary, in England, as long as the Popular Will is, in the last resort, the governing principle. If the habits of the nation have become accustomed to this system, it would be folly to attempt a sudden change for the sake of theoretic symmetry. Folly, because it could not be done until the General Mind was ripe for the change; when it would follow as the form of the shadow follows the altered shape of the substance that projects it. Thus the Eastern and the Western shores of the Atlantic present the converse political paradoxes, of a Democratic Monarchy and an Oligarchic Democracy!

This difference in the elasticity of the two forms of government accounts for their different effect on the character of Public Men. A man may go to public life in England, ambitious of achieving personal distinction by the championship of great political reforms, and may retain his self-respect and dignity of character through the whole of a distinguished career. Because such is the nature of the Institutions with which he has to deal, that any amount of amendment is possible, and there is no power of force enough to control the Determination of the People. An American Statesman, on the contrary, the moment he exchanges the political arena of his State, (analogous to the Municipalities of England), for that of the Nation, sees that he has no possible prospect of political eminence, except by subservience to the Slave Power,—by sacrificing the interests of Liberty to those of Slavery. Hence that disgraceful system of political prostitution to which all aspirants for preferment must submit. A system to which there are no exceptions, unless it be here and there a political martyr, who endeavors to maintain his faith, though it be at the cost of his political existence.

It is because of the supreme control which the House of Commons exerts over the destinies of the Empire, and of its mighty influence over those of the world, that an election like that which was in progress, at the last advices, is of such an universal and permanent interest. It is prophetic of peaceful and beneficent Revolution. It shows that the popular element is growing stronger and stronger, and more and more conscious of its strength. The defeat of four members of the Whig Government, Sir John Canning, at Nottingham, by Feagus O'Connor, the leader of the Chartists, Thomas Babington Macaulay at Edinburgh, by Mr. Cowan, an Anti-Slavery Church tradesman, Benjamin Hawes, at Lambeth, by Mr. Pearson, the Non-Conformist candidate, and above all, General Fox, at the Tower Hamlets, by GEORGE THOMPSON, (of whose election, presently,) and the return of such men as Henry Vincent for Ipswich, and W. J. Fox for Oldham, speak significantly of change at hand. The principle of progress is at work. Better days are coming. Great things have been already done; but greater yet remain behind. Mighty events are knocking at the door. Many of these, this Parliament will usher into the domain of History. And of yet more and mightier, it will prepare the way and proclaim the advent.—q.

GAME IN ENGLAND AND IN AMERICA. The Christian Register has, of late, been attempting to assert its own anti-slavery character, and that of the American Unitarians. It has even affirmed, we are informed, that it is "not behind even the most rabid abolitionists in just abhorrence of slavery." The quality of its abhorrence may be learned by reading the letter to the Rev. Charles Briggs, Secretary pro tem. of the American Unitarian Association, which will be found in its appropriate place, in its fitting company, on our first page. The production, the silliness of the execution of which is only redeemed by the depravity of its spirit, appears with no word of condemnation on the part of the editor. It is fair to infer, then, either that he does not apprehend the nature of the letter, or that he approves of it.

The English Unitarians will no longer be at a loss to understand the reason of the apathy and indifference of their trans-Atlantic brethren to the wrongs of the American slave. This letter explains it all. It contains the key to the great American Mystery. The negro is, after all, only a sort of *fera natura*—to be preserved for the profit or amusement of the proprietor of the soil—to be bred, worked, bought, sold, branded or shot—in short, to be propagated and kept alive, or thinned out and destroyed according to the interest or the caprice of his master. The Unitarian mission of asserting the Dignity of Human Nature, about which Dr. Channing used to talk so much, is all very fine; but you see, it does not apply to black people. Only think of the Dignity of a Nigger! Why, the Rev. Theodore Clapp and his liberal Congregation at New Orleans would spit their sides at the idea! And what would Dr. Whittridge say to it?

It must be so. Some British Unitarians, misled by the prejudices prevalent in their country, and by the generalities of the Unitarian dialect, thought that the institution in this country which strips three millions of men of their free agency, robs them of every natural, civil and social right, abrogates marriage, brings 'all the charities of father, son and brother' to market, denies to its objects all possibility of improving their condition or rising above the slavish estate in which they were born, shuts out the light of all secular and religious instruction from their minds, and reduces them, as far as it is in the power of man to do it, to the condition of beasts—that such a discourse of reason; we say, they thought that such an institution as this was a general crime which called more loudly than any, or all others, in this land for the interposition of the reforming hand of Christianity, and especially, if it were good for anything, of Unitarian Christianity.

And so they said as much, and tried to stir up the pure minds of the American brethren by way of reminding them of the unhappy slave. But their impudent intermeddling with what was none of their business is rebuked by this letter—written with a delicacy of irony and a keenness of sarcasm only equalled by the nicety of its morality. The boggary elements of their reasoning and appeals are met with that most unanswerable and crushing of arguments, the *argumentum ad hominem*. What business have they, forsooth, to blaspheme our system of slavery, or to dictate what we are to do about it, when they have a system, in their own country, quite as bad? Even the SYSTEM OF THE GAME LAWS! They point to the unutterable woes which make a hell of earth to millions of men as good as themselves, under the system of American slavery, and abuse the American brethren to gird themselves for their deliverance. And they are told, with a holy smirk, to look at their own partridges, pheasants and hares, and to the evils that flow from the laws for securing property in them! Truly, this is making game of humanity!

We trust, however, that our British friends will not suffer themselves to be warned of the premises as easily as this writer thinks. We hope they will still continue to poach upon the American manor. There is plenty of game yet to be brought down. They are too good sportsmen not to know that when the feathers dry, and the birds flutter, that the shot has told. Let them proclaim a grand *bag*, and

struggles, but is forever clasping her round with a closer and closer embrace. It is politically omnipotent, and, of course, will set its pleasure. No political pressure from without can modify its action, as long as such pressure must be directed against that same Constitution which gives it its despotic power. The only hope of Freedom is, that its very unyieldingness may, in process of events, break the machine in pieces; so that a wiser scheme of government may be constructed out of the ruins, and with the experience, of the original failure.

It makes no difference as to the working of our Government, that the controlling members of it are appointed by ballot. The slaveholding majority will represent the will of the supreme slaveholding power, of whatsoever individuals it may be made up. So it is of no practical consequence that the Kingly office, and even the Upper House of the Legislature, should be hereditary, in England, as long as the Popular Will is, in the last resort, the governing principle. If the habits of the nation have become accustomed to this system, it would be folly to attempt a sudden change for the sake of theoretic symmetry. Folly, because it could not be done until the General Mind was ripe for the change; when it would follow as the form of the shadow follows the altered shape of the substance that projects it. Thus the Eastern and the Western shores of the Atlantic present the converse political paradoxes, of a Democratic Monarchy and an Oligarchic Democracy!

ROMANCE OF SLAVERY.

A numerous meeting of the principal Whigs of Boston was held last week for the purpose of inviting that profligate man-stealer, Henry Clay, to visit this city. A very numerous Committee was chosen to make the necessary arrangements, and a sub-committee despatched to meet Mr. Clay with a personal proffer of the hospitalities of the Whig Party in Boston. But it being ascertained that the great compromiser would not come further North than Cape May, the ambassadors proceeded no farther than New York.

As no particular political motive can be assigned for this act, as it is hardly to be supposed that even the penchant of the Whigs for being licked will lead them to run Mr. Clay again, it can only be accounted for the personal admiration of his character. A slaveholder of the slaveholders, impudent and impudent, one who has insulted all Civilization by the unblushing effrontery of his defiance of human bondage, and who has done more to maintain than all other public men put together, is invited to the hospitalities of moral, religious, puritan Boston as the man of men whom she delights to honor! And we perceive on the list among the other "gentle men of property and standing," several eminent saints, members of Orthodox churches, not to say deacons and elders!

We say nothing about Mr. Clay's character as a duelist, a gambler or a debauchee, for all these things assume the dignity of virtues alongside of his proficiency as a stealer of men and a champion of man-stealing. The waters of his recent baptism may have washed away these his peccadilloes in the eyes of these holy men, but as the supporters of the anti-slavery resolutions of Whig Legislatures and Conventions, we should marvel at their conduct, did we not know that there is no camel of wickedness too great for the gullet of a pious politician.

The Boston Atlas, edited by Mr. Schouler, who, when editor of the Lowell Courier, professed to be an anti-slavery Whig, deeply laments this disappointment, and affirms that had he come, Mr. Clay would have a reception such as has not been seen since the visit of Lafayette. Perhaps it would have been so, but we wonder any man could put the two names into the same sentence. It is blasphemy against liberty! Among the last words of Lafayette was the memorable declaration to Clarkson, "I never would have drawn my sword in behalf of America, could I have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of Slavery." We fancy he would have refused the unanimous homage paid to him by the gratitude of Boston in 1824, had he been told that a demonstration as enthusiastic awaited the most insolent champion of slavery in 1847.

And the observable thing is, that Henry Clay has been as profligate in his public as in his private character, and that he has betrayed the interests of these very Whigs, when it suited his purpose, as unscrupulously as he has habitually done those of Freedom! And yet here they are, vying with each other in the servility of their prostrations before him! Truly it would task the mathematical genius of Zerah Colburn himself to calculate how many years, or how many slaveholder-powers, it will take to kick a little spirit, consistency and self-respect into the Whigs of Boston.—q.

GAME IN ENGLAND AND IN AMERICA. The Christian Register has, of late, been attempting to assert its own anti-slavery character, and that of the American Unitarians. It has even affirmed, we are informed, that it is "not behind even the most rabid abolitionists in just abhorrence of slavery." The quality of its abhorrence may be learned by reading the letter to the Rev. Charles Briggs, Secretary pro tem. of the American Unitarian Association, which will be found in its appropriate place, in its fitting company, on our first page. The production, the silliness of the execution of which is only redeemed by the depravity of its spirit, appears with no word of condemnation on the part of the editor. It is fair to infer, then, either that he does not apprehend the nature of the letter, or that he approves of it.

The English Unitarians will no longer be at a loss to understand the reason of the apathy and indifference of their trans-Atlantic brethren to the wrongs of the American slave. This letter explains it all. It contains the key to the great American Mystery. The negro is, after all, only a sort of *fera natura*—to be preserved for the profit or amusement of the proprietor of the soil—to be bred, worked, bought, sold, branded or shot—in short, to be propagated and kept alive, or thinned out and destroyed according to the interest or the caprice of his master. The Unitarian mission of asserting the Dignity of Human Nature, about which Dr. Channing used to talk so much, is all very fine; but you see, it does not apply to black people. Only think of the Dignity of a Nigger! Why, the Rev. Theodore Clapp and his liberal Congregation at New Orleans would spit their sides at the idea! And what would Dr. Whittridge say to it?

It must be so. Some British Unitarians, misled by the prejudices prevalent in their country, and by the generalities of the Unitarian dialect, thought that the institution in this country which strips three millions of men of their free agency, robs them of every natural, civil and social right, abrogates marriage, brings 'all the charities of father, son and brother' to market, denies to its objects all possibility of improving their condition or rising above the slavish estate in which they were born, shuts out the light of all secular and religious instruction from their minds, and reduces them, as far as it is in the power of man to do it, to the condition of beasts—that such a discourse of reason; we say, they thought that such an institution as this was a general crime which called more loudly than any, or all others, in this land for the interposition of the reforming hand of Christianity, and especially, if it were good for anything, of Unitarian Christianity.

And so they said as much, and tried to stir up the pure minds of the American brethren by way of reminding them of the unhappy slave. But their impudent intermeddling with what was none of their business is rebuked by this letter—written with a delicacy of irony and a keenness of sarcasm only equalled by the nicety of its morality. The boggary elements of their reasoning and appeals are met with that most unanswerable and crushing of arguments, the *argumentum ad hominem*. What business have they, forsooth, to blaspheme our system of slavery, or to dictate what we are to do about it, when they have a system, in their own country, quite as bad? Even the SYSTEM OF THE GAME LAWS! They point to the unutterable woes which make a hell of earth to millions of men as good as themselves, under the system of American slavery, and abuse the American brethren to gird themselves for their deliverance. And they are told, with a holy smirk, to look at their own partridges, pheasants and hares, and to the evils that flow from the laws for securing property in them! Truly, this is making game of humanity!

We trust, however, that our British friends will not suffer themselves to be warned of the premises as easily as this writer thinks. We hope they will still continue to poach upon the American manor. There is plenty of game yet to be brought down. They are too good sportsmen not to know that when the feathers dry, and the birds flutter, that the shot has told. Let them proclaim a grand *bag*, and

